



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.						
10/807,497	03/23/2004	Kenichi Shimazaki	1122.70096	3046						
7590 08/05/2008										
Patrick G. Burns, Esq. GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD. Suite 2500 300 South Wacker Dr. Chicago, IL 60606		<table border="1"><tr><td>EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td>SUGLO, JANET L</td></tr><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td>2857</td><td></td></tr></table>			EXAMINER	SUGLO, JANET L	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2857	
EXAMINER										
SUGLO, JANET L										
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER									
2857										
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE							
		08/05/2008	PAPER							

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/807,497	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SHIMAZAKI ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> JANET L. SUGLO	<b>Art Unit</b> 2857

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-6 and 13-27 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-6 and 13-27 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 August 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. The action is responsive to the Amendment filed on May 2, 2008. Claims 1-6 and 13-27 are pending. Claims 1, 5, and 21 have been amended. Claims 7-12 have been cancelled.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. **Claims 1-6 and 13-27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention

Independent **claims 1, 5, and 21** all state "performing load monitoring on the computer system on *only* the load monitoring condition." The specification does not seem to support the limitation of monitoring *only* the load monitoring condition. Although the specification does focus on monitoring the load monitoring condition, it is not exclusive of monitoring other conditions

Independent **claims 1, 5, and 21** all state “measuring a resource situation, *other than the response or the throughput* from the step of measuring a response or a throughput.” The specification does not seem to support the limitation of measuring a resource situation *other than* the response or throughput. The specification doesn’t seem to give any example on what the resource situation could be much less being exclusive of the response or the throughput of the resource situation. In fact, Figures 8 and 9 which are described as explaining the predictions of the resource situation include both throughput and response.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-6 and 13-27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smocha et al. (US Patent 6,694,288) in view of Bertram et al. (US Patent 6,470,464) (hereinafter “Bertram”).

With respect to **claims 1 and 21**, Smocha teaches a load monitoring condition determination method for determining a load monitoring condition for performing load

Art Unit: 2857

monitoring of a computer system comprised of one computer or a plurality of computers (col 3, ln 8-32), wherein the method comprises:

giving a load to the computer system from outside of the computer system (col 3, ln 49-54);

measuring a response or a throughput outside the computer system while the load is given to the computer system (col 4, ln 61-64; col 6, ln 38-53);

measuring a resource situation, other than the response or the throughput from the step of measuring a response or a throughput, inside the computer system while the load is given to the computer system (col 6, ln 38-53);

determining a load monitoring condition used for the load monitoring of the computer system from the amount of load given to the computer, the results of measuring the response or throughput and the results of measuring the resource situation inside the computer system (col 7, ln 56 – col 8, ln 28);

performing load monitoring on the computer system on only the load monitoring condition, or conditions, that have been determined during the previously performed load monitoring condition determining step (col 9, ln 14-55; col 12, ln 42-44; col 13, ln 3-10);

wherein the load monitoring condition includes information, regarding an item being monitored, which computer of the computer system and which item of resources should be monitored and a threshold to be used for monitoring of the monitoring item (col 11, ln 15-30; col 12, ln 29-49; col 13, ln 3-10).

Smocha does not teach that the threshold value corresponds to a measured value of the item being monitored. Bertram teaches using a threshold value for an item being monitored (Bertram: col 11, ln 34-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Smocha to include the threshold of Bertram because using a threshold will allow the system to produce warnings to be sent to the user to enable them to improve the computer system (Bertram: col 3, ln 27-34, col 9, ln 48-56, col 10, ln 42-50).

With respect to **claim 4**, Smocha further teaches the limitations of parent claim 1 wherein determining the load monitoring condition (col 3, ln 8-32):

presenting, to a system administrator, information on the amount of load given to the computer system, the results of measuring the response or throughput and the results of measuring the resource situation inside the computer system (col 12, ln 16-39); and

having a part or all of the load monitoring conditions optimum for load monitoring of the computer system selected by the system administrator and setting the selected information as the load monitoring conditions (col 4, ln 55-64; col 12, ln 16-39).

With respect to **claim 5**, Smocha teaches a load monitoring condition determination system for determining a load monitoring condition for performing load monitoring of a computer system comprised of one computer or a plurality of computers, wherein the system comprises (col 3, ln 8-32);

load generating means for giving a load to the computer system from outside the computer system (Fig. 1: 170; col 3, ln 49-54; col 4, ln 47-54);

external response and throughput measuring means for measuring a response or a throughput outside the computer system while giving the load to the computer system (col 4, ln 61-64; col 6, ln 38-53);

load monitoring condition judgment support means for determining a load monitoring condition used for load monitoring of the computer system from the amount of load given to the computer system (Fig. 1: 190; col 8, ln 13-17), the results of measuring the response or throughput (col 5, ln 7-11) and the results of measuring a resource situation, other than the response or throughput, inside the computer system while giving the load to the computer system (col 6, ln 38-53); and

means for performing load monitoring on the computer system on only the load monitoring condition, or conditions, that have been previously determined during the load monitoring condition determining step (col 9, ln 14-55; col 12, ln 42-44; col 13, ln 3-10);

wherein the load monitoring condition includes information, regarding an item being monitoring, which computer of the computer system and which item of resources should be monitored and a threshold to be used for monitoring of the monitoring item (col 11, ln 15-30; col 12, ln 29-49; col 13, ln 3-10).

Smocha does not teach that the threshold value corresponds to a measured value of the item being monitored. Bertram teaches using a threshold value for an item being monitored (Bertram: col 11, ln 34-36). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Smocha to include the threshold of Bertram because using a threshold will allow the system to produce warnings to be sent to the user to enable them to improve the computer system (Bertram: col 3, ln 27-34, col 9, ln 48-56, col 10, ln 42-50).

With respect to **claims 6, 22, and 23**, Smocha further teaches the load monitoring condition judgment support means relates to the load given to the results of measuring the resource situation inside the computer system (col 3, ln 8-32):

detects a resource item having responded well in conjunction with the load given and sets the resource item that responded well as the item being monitored (col 3, ln 36-39; col 10, ln 1-5),

determines the threshold as a criterion for monitoring the resource item, by calculating from the measured response (col 12, ln 7-15) or throughput (col 6, ln 48-53) and physical limitation (col 6, ln 35-37, ln 54-58).

With respect to **claims 2, 16 and 22**, Smocha further teaches the load monitoring condition includes (col 3, ln 8-32):

relating the load given from the outside to the results of measuring the resource situation inside the computer system (col 3, ln 36-39; col 10, ln 1-5);

thereby detecting a resource item having responded well in conjunction with the load setting (col 11, ln 50-62) rendering the resource item that responded well as the item being monitored (col 12, ln 16-23); and

determining the threshold, as a criterion for monitoring the resource item, by any of means of marginal performance calculated from measured response (col 12, ln 7-15) or throughput (col 6, ln 48-53).

With respect to **claims 3, 17, and 24**, Smocha further teaches the limitations of parent claims 2, 5 and 21 wherein determining the load monitoring condition includes: in the case where the results of measuring the response or throughput show the marginal performance, determining the threshold based on the results of measuring the resource situation of the resource item that responded well in conjunction with the load (col 12, ln 7-23).

With respect to **claims 13 and 23**, Smocha further teaches all the limitations of parent claim 1 wherein determining the load monitoring condition includes:

relating the load given externally to the results of measuring the resource situation inside the computer system (col 3, ln 36-39; col 10, ln 1-5);

thereby detecting a resource item having responded well in conjunction with the load setting the resource item that responded well as the item being monitored (col 11, ln 50-62); and

determining the threshold, as a criterion for monitoring the resource item, by physical limitation calculated from the results of measuring the resource situation (col 6, ln 35-37, ln 54-58).

With respect to **claims 14, 18, and 25**, Smocha further teaches the load monitoring condition determination method according to parent claim 13 as shown above, wherein determining the load monitoring condition includes:

in the case where the results of measuring the resource situation of the monitored resource item show the physical limitation, determining the threshold based on the physical limitation of resource item having responded well in conjunction with the load (col 6, ln 35-37, ln 54-62; col 11, ln 19-22).

With respect to **claim 20**, Smocha further teaches the load monitoring condition determination system according to parent claim 5 as shown above, comprising threshold monitoring means for performing the load monitoring of the computer system using the determined load monitoring condition (col 11, ln 20-23; col 12, ln 29-39).

With respect to **claim 27**, Smocha further teaches determining the load monitoring condition including:

presenting, to a system administrator, information on the amount of load given to the computer system, the results of measuring the response or throughput and the results of measuring the resource situation inside the computer system (col 11, ln 5-30; col 12, ln 1-6); and

having part or all of the load monitoring conditions optimum for load monitoring of the computer system selected by the system administrator and setting the selected

information as the load monitoring conditions (col 9, ln 63 – col 10, ln 10; col 12, ln 29-32; col 13, ln 3-10).

With respect to **claims 15, 19, and 26**, Smocha does not teach predicting values. Bertram teaches that if the results of measuring the response or throughput do not show the marginal performance and the resource determined as the monitoring item does not show the physical limitation (Bertram: col 5, ln 56-65), predicting the marginal performance of the response or throughput from the results of measuring the response or throughput (Bertram: col 10, ln 41-54), predicting the resource situation of the monitoring item at the predicted marginal performance of the response or throughput from the results of measuring the resource situation inside the computer system (Bertram: col 10, ln 55-58), and determining the threshold based on the predicted resource situation (Bertram: col 11, ln 23-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Smocha to include the prediction model of Bertram et al. because predicting a resource situation will allow the system to produce warnings to be sent to the user to enable them to improve the computer system (Bertram: col 3, ln 27-34, col 9, ln 48-56).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed May 2, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Smocha does not teach determining a criterion for monitoring *in the future*, but instead related to eliminating certain values within a set of data that *has already been collected*" (Applicant's remarks 10/01/07 from page 17, In 18-19); however, Applicant's arguments are not well taken. There is nothing claimed that states determining a criterion for monitoring *in the future*. What is claimed is performing load monitoring on the computers system on only the load monitoring condition, or conditions, that have been determined during the previously performed load monitoring condition determining step. This can be interpreted to mean that calculations are only carried out for measurements that are previously determined significant. The limitation never states that the determining a criterion for monitoring in the future. Smocha discusses identifying a pattern of sampling to allow a more directed analysis to be performed (Smocha: col 9, Inn 14-17). Smocha further teaches analyzing (or performing load monitoring) on only the data that has been identified as needing further attention (Smocha: col 9, In 18-55). Smocha mentions multiple times that segments of the data are designated significant in order to further analyze only the significant data samples (Smocha: col 12, In 42-44; col 13, In 3-10). Therefore the first step in Smocha is to determine a load monitoring condition and then use that information to perform load monitoring – which would match the *in the future* argument.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JANET L. SUGLO whose telephone number is (571)272-8584. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eliseo Ramos-Feliciano can be reached on 571-272-7925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JANET L SUGLO/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2857

/Eliseo Ramos-Feliciano/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2857